

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/534, 294

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Frederick J. Parker

Art Unit

~~1792~~ 1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frederick J. Parker.

(3) _____

(2) Pat. Stiemmer

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1/17/08

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: allIdentification of prior art discussed: EP 982 120

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the meaning of the test procedure relative to the coating process. Applicants recognized that the selection criteria derived from testing produce coatings which bind at lower temperatures. We both agreed this is a very difficult claim to word so as to overcome prior art issues.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required